

REMARKS:

In the Office action mailed September 9, 2004 ("the Office Action"), the Examiner objected to claim 3 and rejected claims 1, 2, and 4-16. This reply amends claims 1-10 and 11-16. Therefore, claims 1-16 are pending and under consideration.

I. Correction of priority claim

Because of a typographical error, the transmittal sheet filed October 12, 2001 claimed priority to U.S. Application No. 09/778,485 instead of to U.S. Application No. 09/788,485.

This reply corrects the problem by amending the specification so that the first sentence of the specification contains a reference to U.S. Application No. 09/788,485. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to correct the Application's priority information in PALM, PAIR, and the Office's other computer systems.

II. Response to §101 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §101. This reply amends claim 1 and 14 to address the issue raised by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

III. Claim Objection

In the Office Action the Examiner objected to claim 3 and indicated that this claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 3 has been so rewritten and it is submitted that this claim has not been narrowed and has the same scope as prior to being made independent and is now allowable. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

IV Response to §103(a) Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 4-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,895,450 ("Sloo") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,330,551 ("Burchetta"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Sloo and Burchetta, when viewed as a whole, do not teach or suggest all the features of claim 1. Claim 1 includes arranging response information in accordance with the priorities of request contents. Neither Sloo nor Burchetta teach or suggest this feature. Sloo is directed to a method of using a computer network to register complaints and settle disputes. Burchetta is also directed to a computerized dispute resolution system. Because Sloo and Burchetta, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest arranging response information in accordance with the priorities of request contents, claim 1 is patentable over Sloo in view of Burchetta.

Claims 2 and 4-16 are patentable over Sloo in view of Burchetta for at least the same reason claim 1 is patentable over Sloo in view of Burchetta.

The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 4 calls for analyzing an abstract request and forming requesting conditions. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

III. Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1/10/15

By: 
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501